

CFACT CLIMATE TRUTH FILE: 2014

The scientific reality is that virtually every claim – from A to Z – of the promoters of manmade climate fears is falling short or going in the opposite direction from reality.

- Global temperatures have flat-lined for almost 18 years according to satellite data, and the peer-reviewed literature is now scaling back predictions of future warming.
- The U.S. has had no Category 3 or larger hurricane make landfall since 2005 -- the longest spell since the Civil War.
- Strong F3 or larger tornadoes have been in decline since the 1970s.
- Antarctic Sea Ice is at record expansion, and Arctic sea ice has recovered in recent years.
- Despite claims of snow being 'a thing of the past,' cold-season snowfall has been rising.
- Sea level rise rates have been steady for over a century, with recent deceleration.
- Droughts and floods are not historically unusual, nor caused by mankind, and there is no evidence we are currently having any unusual weather.
- Deaths due to extreme weather have declined dramatically.
- Polar bears are doing fine, with their numbers way up since the 1960s.

Climate Science Background Q & A:

CO2 is a greenhouse gas and it has been rising steadily. How can you deny global warming?

CO2 is not the tail that wags the dog. CO2 is a trace essential gas, but without it life on Earth would be impossible. Carbon dioxide fertilizes algae, trees, and crops to provide food for humans and animals. We inhale oxygen and exhale CO2. Slightly higher atmospheric CO2 levels cannot possibly supplant the numerous complex and inter-connected forces that have always determined Earth's climate.

As University of London Professor Emeritus Philip Stott has noted: "The fundamental point has always been this. Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables, and the very idea that we can manage climate change predictably by understanding and manipulating at the margins one politically selected factor (CO2) is as misguided as it gets."

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

Even the global warming activists at RealClimate.org acknowledged this in a September 20, 2008, article, where they said "The actual temperature rise is an emergent property resulting from interactions among hundreds of factors."

Haven't the past few years shown global warming to be worse than we thought?

As the real-world evidence mounts that global warming claims are failing, climate activists have ramped up predictions of future climate change impacts, declaring that it is "worse than we thought." But a prediction or projection 50 to 100 years into the future is not "evidence."

If CO2 is not the main driver of global temperatures, what is? The sun?

When global temperatures are the question, the answer is not the sun or CO2. It is the sun, volcanoes, tilt of the Earth's axis, water vapor, methane, clouds, ocean cycles, plate tectonics, shifting ocean currents, albedo (Earth's changing reflective properties), atmospheric dust, atmospheric circulation, cosmic rays, particulates like carbon soot and volcanic dust, forests and grasslands, urban and other land use changes. Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, not just CO2.

How can you ignore thousands of scientists who say manmade global warming is a serious threat?

The idea that there is a "scientific consensus" does not hold up. Scientists who are skeptical about "dangerous manmade climate change" have been speaking out for years. Many prominent former believers in manmade global warming announced they were reconsidering the science.

"Gaia" scientist James Lovelock had been "alarmist" about climate change for years. Now he says "The problem is we don't know what the climate is doing. We thought we knew 20 years ago."

Other scientists like Dr. Leonard Bengtsson, Dr. Judith Curry, and UN IPCC Lead Author Dr. Richard Tol are growing more skeptical of climate claims.

In 2010, a report documented that More Than 1,000 International Scientists Dissented over Manmade Global Warming Claims. Many of them were former IPCC scientists.

Climate scientist Mike Hulme dismantled the "thousands of scientists agree" claim put forth by the United Nations and news media. Claims that "2,500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant influence on the climate" are

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

disingenuous, Hulme noted. The key scientific case for CO2 driving global warming, like many others in the IPCC reports, "is reached by only a few dozen experts in the specific field of detection and attribution studies; other IPCC authors are experts in other fields." Other scientists are excluded or not consulted.

Dr. William Schlesinger agrees with the UN climate view but has admitted that only 20% of UN IPCC scientists deal with climate. In other words, 80% of the UN's IPCC membership are experts in other fields and have no dealing with or expertise in climate change as part of their academic studies.

How can you reject the National Academy of Sciences and other science organizations, which all agree that manmade global warming is a threat?

Proponents of manmade global warming often point out that the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and American Meteorological Society (AMS) have issued statements endorsing the so-called "consensus" view that human emissions drive climate change. However, neither the NAS nor the AMS has ever allowed member scientists to vote directly on these statements. A couple dozen members of the institutions' governing boards produced the statements - and then issue press releases.

The governing boards are steeped in politics and seek more funding for "research" that promotes currently accepted viewpoints. The full membership of actual scientists never gets to vote on the activist statements and in many cases is completely unaware until too late that the boards have issued them. Many such organizations have faced open rebellion by their skeptical member scientists for such actions: the American Chemical Society, the American Physical Society, and the International Geological Congress.

97% of scientists say manmade climate change is real.

The claim that "97% of scientists agree" is in part based on 77 anonymous scientists who responded to a survey. The survey started by seeking opinions from 10,257 scientists. However, only 77 responded. So the 97% "consensus" claim is not based on thousands of scientists or even hundreds of scientists - but only on 77. Out of those 77 scientists, 75 answered the survey to form the mythical 97% "consensus."

In 2013 and 2014, other claims of an alleged 97% climate 'consensus' emerged, prompting UN IPCC lead author Dr. Richard Tol to publish a critique and declare: 'The 97% is essentially pulled from thin air, it is not based on any credible research whatsoever.'

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

The new 97% claim by climate activist John Cook was so "so broad that it incorporates the views of most prominent climate skeptics.'

Another researcher, Andrew Montford, commented: 'The [97%] consensus as described by the survey is virtually meaningless and tells us nothing about the current state of scientific opinion beyond the trivial observation that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas and that human activities have warmed the planet to some unspecified extent."

Lord Christopher Monckton's analysis found that "only 41 papers - 0.3% of all 11,944 abstracts or 1.0% of the 4014 expressing an opinion, and not 97.1%" actually endorsed the claim that "more than half of recent global warming was anthropogenic."

Bjorn Lomborg wrote: "Do you remember the 97% consensus' which even Obama tweeted? Turns out the authors don't want to reveal their data. It has always been a dodgy paper. Virtually everyone I know in the debate would automatically be included in the 97%."

The 'Hottest years' on record occurred in recent years.

Actually, global temperatures have been holding steady for almost two decades (nearly 18 years according to RSS satellite data, and 19 years according to a new study: "**New paper on 'the pause' says it is 19 years at surface**")." While 2005 and 2010 were both declared "hottest" years by global warming proponents, a closer examination revealed that the claims were "based on year-to-year temperature data that differ by only a few HUNDREDTHS of a degree Fahrenheit -- differences that were within the margin of error in the data. In other words, global temperatures have held very steady with no sign of "acceleration."

Isn't the U.S. experiencing unprecedented heat waves?

Climatologist Dr. John Christy: "About 75% of the states recorded their hottest temperature prior to 1955, and over 50% of the states experienced their record cold temperatures after 1940." In 2014, the U.S. experienced a brutally cold winter and a cool summer.

Arctic ice melted to record lows in 2012. Isn't that due to manmade global warming?

Recent Arctic ice changes are not "proof" of manmade global warming, nor are they unprecedented, unusual, or cause for alarm, according to experts and multiple peer-reviewed studies. After weeks of media hype blaming global warming, NASA finally admitted in September 2012 that an August Arctic cyclone "broke up" and "wreaked havoc" on sea ice.

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

According to NASA: "The cyclone remained stalled over the Arctic for several days ... pushing [sea ice] south to warmer waters, where it melted."

In 2013, the Arctic ice cap grew by 29% over 2012 in the summer, with 533,000 more square miles of ocean covered with ice than in 2012.

In 2014, the Arctic ice cap grew even more and neared a decadal high.

Global warming activists have long hyped satellite era data, which begin in 1979, to claim record low Arctic sea ice - while ignoring the satellite data that show record sea ice *expansion* in the Antarctic. Moreover, satellite monitoring of Arctic ice began at the end of a 40-year cold cycle (remember the 1970s fears of a coming ice age?), when ice was most likely at its highest extent in the modern era.

We have had similar Arctic ice panics in the past. A November 2, 1922, *Washington Post* article was headlined: "Arctic Ocean getting warm: Seals vanish and icebergs melt." The Arctic Ocean is warming, icebergs are growing scarcer, and in places the seals are finding the water too hot, it said.

Isn't manmade global warming causing extreme weather?

"There is a lack of evidence to blame humans for an increase in extreme events. One cannot convict CO2 of causing any of these events, because they've happened in the past before CO2 levels rose," climatologist John Christy testified before Congress in 2012. "There are innumerable types of events that can be defined as extreme events - so for the enterprising individual (unencumbered by the scientific method), weather statistics can supply an unlimited, target-rich environment in which to discover a 'useful' extreme event."

"There is no evidence that disasters are getting worse because of climate change," notes Professor Roger Pielke, Jr. "There's really no evidence that we're in the midst of an extreme weather era - whether man has influenced climate or not."

Aren't hurricanes getting bigger, stronger, and more frequent due to manmade global warming?

As of 2014, the U.S. has gone nine years (since Hurricane Wilma in 2005) with no category 3 or larger hurricanes making landfall, the longest spell since at least 1900.

The U.S. is currently in a record-breaking hurricane drought, with the last category 4-5 hurricane at landfall in the US 22 years ago in 1992 [Andrew]. For the United States, during the past four decades, "the

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

fewest number of major hurricanes struck during any 40-year period since at least the 1800s."

The worst decade for major (category 3, 4, and 5) hurricanes was the 1940s, according to the website *Real Science*, which analyzed National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration data. In 2011, a new study found that "overall global tropical cyclone activity has decreased to historically low levels during the past five years."

Isn't global warming causing bigger more dangerous tornadoes?

No. In fact, big tornadoes have seen a drop in frequency since the 1950s. "There has been a downward trend in strong (F3) to violent (F5) tornadoes in U.S. since 1950s." In fact, "warming causes fewer strong tornadoes, not more," climatologist Dr. Roy Spencer explained.

The years 2012, 2013, and 2014, have all seen at or near record low tornado counts in the U.S.

There is "no scientific consensus or connection between global warming and tornadic activity," emphasized Greg Carbin, tornado warning coordination meteorologist at NOAA's Storm Prediction Center in Norman, Oklahoma. "NOAA statistics show that the last 60 years have seen a dramatic increase in the *reporting* of weak tornadoes, but *no change* in the number of severe to violent ones," Corbin commented.

Don't we need to stop global warming, to keep cities from being inundated by rising seas?

Sea levels have been rising since the last ice age ended more than 10,000 years ago. There is currently no acceleration in sea level rise.

'Global sea levels have been naturally rising for ~20,000 years and have decelerated over the past 8,000 years, decelerated over the 20th century, decelerated 31% since 2002, and decelerated 44% since 2004 to less than 7 inches per century. There is no evidence of an acceleration of sea level rise, and therefore no evidence of any effect of mankind on sea levels.

According to tide gauges, sea Level is rising LESS than the thickness of one nickel (1.95 mm thick) per year or about the thickness of one penny (1.52 mm thick) a year. According to satellite info it is rising slightly more than two pennies a year (3.04 mm).

Aren't the recent droughts in the U.S. due to manmade global warming?

Across time scales required for any meaningful analysis, "droughts have, for the most part, become shorter, less frequent, and cover a smaller portion of the U.S. over the last century," Professor Roger Pielke, Jr., observes. "U.S. Midwestern drought has decreased in past 50+ years? That is not skepticism; that's according to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change," he adds.

Even U.S. government scientists have admitted that recent droughts are not due to climate change. "This is not a climate change drought," said Dr. Robert Hoerling, a NOAA research meteorologist, who served as the lead author of the U.S. Climate Change Science Plan Synthesis and Assessment Report: "The good news," he emphasized, "is that this isn't global warming. This is not the new normal in terms of drought."

For scientists who take the long view of history, the U.S. drought of 2012 is "merely a climatological blip, E&E News reported in an article titled, "Dust Bowl and 1988 both eclipse 2012 drought, scientists say."

What about California's record drought?

California's current drought is not related to climate change. Much more severe California droughts occurred with lower allegedly 'safe' CO2 levels. According to the data, 'Past dry periods have lasted more than 200 years.' Researchers have documented multiple droughts in California that lasted 10 or 20 years in a row during the past 1,000 years -- compared to the mere 3-year duration of the current dry spell. The two most severe mega-droughts make the Dust Bowl of the 1930s look tame: A 240-year-long drought that started in 850 A.D., and, 50 years after the conclusion of that one, another drought that stretched at least 180 years.

Isn't manmade global warming causing increases in rainfall?

No. Any attempt to link manmade global warming to rainfall events in any specific region is the stuff of pure politics - not science. Current data show that global precipitation has actually undergone a slight *decrease* over the past 30 years. As a result of this and similar realities, global warming activists are desperately seeking to tie any and all weather events to global warming.

In Australia, climate activists were caught blaming too little rain on manmade global warming and then - when there was too much rain - they blamed *that* on manmade global warming. Other studies have found both temperatures and precipitation were higher 1,000 years ago during the Medieval Warm Period.

Isn't climate change making floods more severe?

Peer-reviewed studies reject these claims, too. "Are US floods increasing? The answer is still 'No,'" says a new scientific paper by Roger Pielke, Jr. The evidence demonstrates that "flooding has not increased in U.S. over records of 85 to 127 years. This adds to a pile of research that shows similar results around the world," Pielke said. It is also worth noting that "the world's ten deadliest floods all occurred before 1976." In other words, "All of the world's deadliest floods occurred with CO2 well below 350 ppm."

In addition, a recent study by the U.S. government found no evidence that climate change caused more severe flooding during last century. In fact, the U.S. Geological Survey found that in some regions "floods become *less severe* as greenhouse gas emissions increased." Moreover, at this time, "we do not see a clear pattern that enables us to understand how climate change will alter flood conditions in the future," USGS scientist Robert Hirsch explained.

Aren't wildfires getting worse?

No. "Data from both the U.S. and Canada show the number of wildfires has declined over the past 40 to 50 years and that the number of wildfires was higher during the global cooling scare of the 1970s." In fact, the number of U.S. wildfires has dropped 10% per decade. The U.S. government's National Interagency Fire Center has reported that U.S. wildfires now occur "half as often as they did 50 years ago."

Spanish researchers confirmed climate change is not to blame for increased forest fires. "The change in the occurrence of fires that are recorded in the historical research cannot be explained by the gradual change in climate," they reported. Instead, it "corresponds to changes in the availability of fuel, the use of sources of energy, and the continuity of the landscape." In the United States, wildfires also result from a failure to thin forests or remove dead and diseased trees - largely because environmentalist protests and lawsuits have blocked such removals.

Aren't polar bears dying and threatened with extinction by receding Arctic ice?

No. Polar bears are at or near historic population highs. The only threats they face are from virtual world computer model predictions that do not reflect reality or account for the adaptability of these animals.

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

"The only reason the service listed them was based on speculation from fairly untested models, based on what the fate of polar bears may be in the future," perhaps if global warming ever dramatically alters the bears' habitat, Alaska's coordinator for endangered species explained.

The polar bear population is very, very healthy," Canadian Inuit have emphasized. "We live in polar bear country. We understand the polar bears. We are unanimous in our belief that polar bears have not declined."

Evolutionary biologist and paleo-zoologist Dr. Susan Crockford of the University of Victoria agrees. "Polar bears have survived several episodes of much warmer climate over the last 10,000 years than exists today," she wrote. "There is no evidence to suggest that the polar bear or its food supply is in danger of disappearing entirely with increased Arctic warming, regardless of the dire fairy-tale scenarios predicted by computer models."

Crockford added: "The annual minimum reached in late summer has little impact on polar bear health and survival. What matters most to polar bears is the presence of ample ice in spring and early summer (March-June), which is their critical feeding period."

University of Iceland professor and award-winning quaternary geologist Dr. Olafur Ingolfsson notes that a fossil specimen "confirms that the polar bear was a morphologically distinct species at least 100,000 years ago, and this basically means that the polar bear has already survived one interglacial period." This tells us that, "despite the ongoing warming in the Arctic today, maybe we don't have to be quite so worried about the polar bear."

Professor J. Scott Armstrong, a forecasting expert at the Wharton School, says polar bear models are critically flawed. "To list a species that is currently in good health as an endangered species requires valid forecasts that its population would decline to levels that threaten its viability. In fact, the polar bear populations have been increasing rapidly in recent decades, due to hunting restrictions.

Biologist Josef Reichholf heads the Vertebrates Department at the National Zoological Collection in Munich. "In warmer regions, it takes far less effort to ensure survival," he points out. "How did the polar bear survive the last warm period? Whether bears survive will depend on human beings, not the climate."

Don't graphs show that current temperatures are the highest in 1,000 years?

Penn State professor and UN IPCC modeler Michael Mann did publish a hockey stick-shaped graph that purportedly showed an unprecedented sudden increase in average global temperatures, following ten centuries of supposedly stable climate. However, Dr. Mann was at the center of the Climategate scandal. His graph and the data and methodology behind it have been scrutinized and debunked in peer-reviewed studies by numerous climate scientists, statisticians, and other experts.

The latest research clearly reveals that the Medieval Warm Period (also called the Medieval Climate Optimum) has been verified and was in fact global, not just confined to the Northern Hemisphere. The Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change reported in 2009 that "the Medieval Warm Period was (1) global in extent, (2) at least as warm as, but likely even warmer than, the Current Warm Period, and (3) of a duration significantly longer than that of the Current Warm Period to date."

The Science and Public Policy Institute reported in May 2009: "More than 700 scientists from 400 institutions in 40 countries have contributed peer-reviewed papers providing evidence that the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) was real, global, and warmer than the present. And the numbers grow larger daily."

Weren't the Climategate scientists exonerated - meaning there was no scandal?

Many in the media repeatedly cite the various Climategate investigations as an "exoneration" of the UN global warming scientists. But a closer look reveals that the investigations were nothing more than the global warming industry pretending to investigate itself, and of course pretending to find no wrongdoing.

Penn State's investigation of Michael Mann is a prime example of what a mockery the process became. Clive Crook of the *Atlantic Monthly* summed it up this way: "The Penn State inquiry exonerating Michael Mann would be difficult to parody. Three of four allegations were dismissed out of hand at the outset."

Why do you oppose government taking steps to solve the climate crisis?

Despite all the evidence and studies presented in this paper, many people continue to say that Congress and the United Nations need to take

CLIMATE TRUTH FILE 2014

immediate action to prevent more extreme weather, rising sea levels, and planetary "overheating." The reality is that politicians who say government "can do something about" droughts, floods, sea levels, hurricanes, and tornadoes are practicing the equivalent of medieval witchcraft.

Laws, treaties, and regulations - whether from the United Nations, the U.S. Congress, or the Environmental Protection Agency, cannot control the weather. CO2 does not control global temperatures, and current global temperatures are well within natural variability, as demonstrated by surface and satellite data and extensive historic records. Scientific studies and data also show that droughts, floods, and wildfires, and extreme weather are not unusual, unprecedented, or related to CO2 emissions or climate change.

Shouldn't Congress pass a cap-and-trade bill or carbon tax to help heal the climate?

The climate bill that died in the Democrat-controlled Senate was a scientifically meaningless bill that Obama's own EPA admitted would not impact global CO2 levels - let alone global temperatures.

The climate bill would only have raised the cost of energy for American families and businesses, while doing nothing for the climate. A major Bloomberg News report revealed that U.S. oil companies would likely cope with the climate legislation by "closing fuel plants, cutting capital spending, and increasing imports." Bloomberg also reported that "one in six U.S. refineries probably would close by 2020," and this could "add 77 cents a gallon to the price of gasoline."

What about EPA climate regulations, will they impact the climate?

Not a chance. The EPA's unilateral "carbon dioxide endangerment" regulations would have no impact on global carbon dioxide emissions, let alone global temperatures. The EPA regulations are pure climate symbolism in exchange for a more centrally planned energy economy.

The EPA's own data reveal that any potential climate impact of the regulations would be "so small as to be undetectable."

Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow ♦ Washington, DC ♦ 202-429-2737

www.CFACT.org